

REMARKS

Claims 19-21 and 23-44 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-18 and 22 have been previously canceled. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the reasons set forth below.

I. Summary of Rejections

Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,256,625 B1 to Breyer et al. (hereafter “Breyer”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,911,066 to Williams et al (hereafter “Williams”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,894,802 B1 to Biondi et al (hereafter “Biondi”).

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer in view of Williams and Biondi, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,986,667 to Jevans, (hereafter “Jevans”).

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Biondi, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0041163 A1 to Rhoades et al. (hereinafter “Rhoades”).

Claims 35, 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Biondi, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,823,524 B1 to Hewett, (hereafter “Hewett”).

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**A. Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-43**

Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer in view of Williams and Biondi. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

1. Claim 19

Claim 19 recites:

A system for transferring data from a data source to multiple data sink objects in a computer system, wherein the data source is coupled to the computer, the system comprising:

- a data source holding acquired data;
- an interface for communicating with the data source to receive the data from the data source;
- a computing device comprising:
 - a processor controlling a data processor that encapsulates the data into a data object in a first memory;
 - a secondary memory comprising a data server for:
 - transferring to the multiple data sink objects identification information identifying the data object, the data server providing a pointer indicating a location of the data object in the memory to identify the data object, the multiple data sink objects accessing the data object using the identification information;
- and

sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data.

Applicants respectfully submit that Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**, as recited in Applicants' claim 19.

In the Office Action, the Examiner correctly indicates that Breyer does not explicitly disclose this claim element (Office Action, page 3, § 5). In the Response to Office Action submitted on July 3, 2008, Applicants argued that Williams fails to teach or suggest this claim feature. In this Office Action, the Examiner does not rely on Williams to reject this claim feature. Instead, the Examiner relies on the newly cited Biondi reference to supply this claim feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Biondi discusses a memory device that allows for a buffering of image data, that can optionally be ranked, to be output to the image sink in a particular order such as in a first-in, first-out manner, a priority transfer manner or other management scheme (Col. 1, lines 40-44). According to Biondi, a user inputs the image to the image data source. The image data corresponding to the input image is then stored in the memory. Then, while a second job is

being input, the captured image data will be transferred to the image data sink (Col. 1, lines 45-50). Biondi is concerned with a multi-job image processing system (Col. 1, line 56).

Biondi, alone or in combination with Breyer and Williams, does not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data** as recited in claim 19. In contrast, Biondi discusses directly transferring the image data to the image data sink. Biondi does not share the data object among the multiple data sink objects. Rather, Biondi transfers the stored image data to an image data sink (Col. 2, line 66 – Col. 3, line 1). Biondi recites that it is preferable that the image data is transferred to the image data sink while additional images are being input from the image source. This way, the memory streamlines the data flow between an image source and an image sink (Col. 3, lines 7-12).

Biondi recites that the image transfer is done in a multi-processing manner that allows the memory and image data source to produce, receive, transfer or manipulate image data (Col. 5, lines 33-36). As such, in Biondi, if the same image data will be sent to multiple sinks, a copy of the image data needs to be created. Therefore, Biondi fails to disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**, as recited in claim 19.

Moreover, the sections of Biondi cited by the Examiner as teaching this claim feature merely recite sending different images to different image data sinks. At the cited section, Biondi recites that the user loads images into the image data source. The image data source then captures images and begins transferring the image data corresponding to the images to an images data sink, for example image data sink #1. A user can then load another image into the image data source. The image data source will then capture any additional images and organize the images into a job without requiring that the previous images have been transferred to the images data sink. The image data source can then transfer any previously stored jobs to the image data sink, for example to image data sink #2 (Col. 4, line 61 – Col. 5, line 5). In contrast, claim 19 recites sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects. Claim 19 is concerned with the same data object being shared among multiple data sink objects.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Breyer, Williams and Biondi fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19.

Specifically, the combination of Breyer, Williams and Biondi fails to disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

2. Claims 20-21, 27-29, 31 and 33

Claims 20, 21, 27-29, 31 and 33 depend from amended claim 19 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of amended claim 19. In light of the arguments presented above, Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 20, 21, 27, 28, 31 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 20, 21, 27-29, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

3. Claim 34

Claim 34 recites similar elements to amended claim 19. Specifically, claim 34 recites, among other elements, **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**. In light of the arguments presented above for claim 19, Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least this claim element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. Claims 36, 42 and 44

Claims 36, 42 and 43 depend from claim 34 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 34. In light of the arguments presented above, Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 36, 42 and 43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 36, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 23-26

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Biondi, and further in view of Jevans.

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data** as recited in claim 19. Claims 23-26 depend from claim 19 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 19. Jevans fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Biondi with regard to at least this claim element.

Jevans does not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**, as recited in claim 19. Jevans discusses attaching a renderer to a view object by calling a procedure and passing in the view object and the renderer object. Thus, in Jevans, the data object is not shared among multiple data sink objects.

Breyer, Williams, Biondi and Jevans, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 19. Accordingly, claims 23-26 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

C. Claims 30 and 32

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Biondi, and further in view of Rhoades.

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**, as recited in amended claim 19. Claims 30 and 32 depend from claim 19 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 19. Rhoades fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Biondi with regard to at least this claim element.

The sections of Rhoades identified by the Examiner discuss real-time streams of data that can be framed into self contained segments [0127]. Rhoades also discusses that streams of datagrams flow between processors [0132]. Rhoades further discusses forwarding the datagrams as a whole [0151]. Thus, Rhoades does not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among**

the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data, as recited in claim 19.

Breyer, Williams, Biondi and Rhoades, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19. Accordingly, claims 30 and 32 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

D. Claims 35 and 37-41

Claims 35 and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Biondi, and further in view of Hewett.

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Biondi, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**, as recited in claim 34. Claims 35 and 37-41 depend from claim 34 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 34. Hewett fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Biondi with regard to at least this claim element.

Hewett is cited by the Examiner to provide teachings for the feature added in claims 35 and 37-41. Hewett discusses managing the distribution of events in a data processing system. Hewett, however, does not disclose or suggest **sharing the data object among the multiple data sink objects to prevent extraneous copies of the data**, as recited in claim 34.

Breyer, Williams, Biondi and Hewett, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 34. Accordingly, claims 35 and 37-41 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 35 and 37-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-035RCE. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: January 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: L0389
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant